

Office of Financial Management
BASS Capital System Improvement Project Kickoff
Meeting Notes - June 13, 2006

Communications

- Website <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/accounting/capital>
- Future meeting dates, times and agendas will be announced via email.

Next Steps

- Issues and options will be sent to you within the next couple of weeks.
 - Please respond to debbie.hoxit@ofm.wa.gov and vicki.rummig@ofm.wa.gov with your preferred recommendations.
-

Agenda

1. Welcome – Tom Saelid, Senior Budget Assistant to the Governor, Capital

- a. This is a new beginning - an opportunity for us to use our diversity to develop the best Capital budgeting system that we can. We must work together through the process – use our skills, sometimes stretch ourselves, and remove the hats we normally wear. The investment in a new system will provide us with tools to do our jobs more effectively. Teamwork will be a key component.
- b. Debbie Hoxit is the project's Business Analyst. She brings extensive experience from the Budget Division. Vicki Rummig is the project's Project Manager. She has substantial experience with BASS. Megan Pilon is the lead BASS Project Manager.
- c. The project team's shared knowledge and experience will be valuable as we move forward.
- d. Vicki Rummig reviewed the agenda. Today's objective is to validate that we are on the right track.

2. Background and Processes – Debbie Hoxit, Business Lead for the Project

- a. Debbie Hoxit has performed an evaluation of current Capital process systems and worked with OFM, Legislative staff and agency analysts to identify potential improvements.
- b. Improving the Capital Budget development process will be this project's initial focus.
- c. We have identified what brings value and where there are opportunities for improvement.
 - i. We are reviewing the decision-making process.
 - ii. We are considering if the capital budget process should be included in the Priorities of Government (POG).
 - iii. Eliminate data re-keying, shadow systems, data that's collected that has no value, obtain information that we really need, and streamline the process.
- d. We will identify options, provide them to you, and obtain your feedback.

3. Project Planning – Vicki Rummig, Project Manager

- a. Today's meeting is the kickoff, and your attendance shows that you are interested in working together to improve how we work - we appreciate it.
- b. We will identify requirements, look at what we currently have, and have a conceptual solution by July 30, 2006.
- c. The plan is to implement a basic system in April 2007 (first phase).
- d. Additional features will be added in December 2007 (final phase).
- e. Q: Since this won't be ready for 07-09, if this new system is implemented, how will old information be put into the new one? R: We don't anticipate making drastic changes to the data structure, and do not expect that you will need to re-key all of your data.
- f. Vicki identified the current project team, their roles and responsibilities and placeholders for future team members (e.g. testers, developers, logistics).

- i. There are many TBDs – details will be filled in as we continue.
- g. We are currently in the requirements gathering phase.
- h. Any shifts in time, scope or resources will affect the balance.
- i. Good communication and your participation in this process will allow us to reach our goals. We invited 200 people to today's meeting, and are very pleased that so many of you are here. Our highest goal is to provide a quality project.

4. Stakeholder Objectives – All

a. Breakout session gathered information – 20 minutes

i. Operating Analyst (OFM and Agency)

- 1. Improve our ability to coordinate with other state and local agencies in capital budget development
 - a. State patrol needs to work with local government to expand sewage capacity, to expand facility
 - b. Local government needs to assemble a “package” involving funding contributions from different agencies.
- 2. Ensure that the strengths of existing agency decision-making and prioritization are reinforced (not undone with interface to new system).
- 3. Inclusion of capital-related functions, analyst, and costs in capital budget development and decision-making (e.g. maintenance costs).
- 4. Pass through grants/facilities

ii. General Administration Project and Management

iii. External Users

- 1. Allotment process
 - a. Monthly
 - b. Single allotment
 - c. Timing of allotments
 - d. Requesting and receiving is bulky
 - e. Lost time waiting for allotment – bidding, construction primarily
- 2. Tracking original request to legislative approved budget/project
- 3. C100
 - a. Cumbersome for Fish & Wildlife, doesn't relate to their projects
 - b. More latitude to use or not to use
 - c. Target scope schedule and budget at OFM levels
 - d. Added database submitted to OFM would be additional work at the agency level, not preferred
 - e. Make C100 and/or other tools more flexible that serve the needs of a variety of agencies
- 4. Timing of some reports and documents for capital projects.

iv. Technical Staff or Managers

- 1. Less movement of data. One centralized data system that all parties have access to.
- 2. More project description information available. Goals & objectives to support from an operational perspective. Include operational stakeholders in decision-making.
- 3. Cost per agency and history each fiscal year.
- 4. Be able to look at other projects to use as planning tools.
- 5. See different versions of the project.
- 6. Continuity across processes/systems
- 7. Help tools

- a. Glossary of terms
 - b. Assumptions/calculations
 - 8. Communication with state treasurer office w/IRS regulations
 - 9. History for each fiscal year.
 - 10. See different versions of the budget.
 - 11. Share information with other agencies and when appropriate, leverage their efforts to assist us in this project.
 - 12. Continuity for all processes. Good flow from budget development to implementation.
 - 13. Provide the State Treasurer the tools to understand the assumptions and calculations we have made.
- v. LEAP - BuildSum Users (both OFM and Legislative)
- 1. Follow a project through its entire life.
 - 2. Obtain data so legislative staff can make good decisions.
 - 3. LEAP has made changes to their BuildSum process and will share their approach with the project team.
 - 4. Want dollars in thousands.
 - 5. The Capital Systems Improvement Project team will compare LEAP's system as we work.
- vi. CBS Users and Agency Capital Staff – group 1
- 1. CBS is used as the sole application for entering data – avoiding the redundancy of entering into a desktop application then reentering into CBS
 - 2. Improve formatting capability and add the feature to upload
 - 3. Linking operating budget with capital budget including the POG process
 - 4. Incorporate cost standards
- vii. CBS Users and Agency Capital Staff – group 2
- 1. Simplify system
 - 2. One time data entry
 - a. Minor works list
 - b. Change a number/fund, priority it changes in all places in that version
 - 3. Better input capabilities.
 - a. Accept format, bullets, etc.
 - b. Import/export
 - c. Able to accept attachments to back up numbers and assumptions
 - 4. Better reporting
 - a. Summary of all projects, amounts, square footage
 - b. Easy way to track numbers to reapprops.
 - 5. Better way to account for minor works list. Submit through the system and OFM and the Legislature see it in the form that they need it.
 - 6. Users see the same reports that OFM and the legislature sees
 - 7. Handle grants different than construction

5. Communication Planning – Vicki Rummig, Project Manager

- a. Information about this project is available at <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/accounting/capital>
- b. This project will use effective project management principles, and the communication plan is a key component.

6. Use Cases & Requirements – Debbie Hoxit, Business Lead for the Project

- a. Background: Use cases were developed from information gained from interviews with agencies.
- b. Debbie reviewed the “Agency Budget Process Future.”

7. Use Case & Requirements Validation – All

- a. The breakout groups reviewed the use case and provided input (hard copy) to the project team.

8. Possible Next Steps

- a. Additional Use Case review. TBD
- b. Conceptual Solution presentation. TBD